

United Community Corporation
Executive Committee Meeting
124 Branford Place
Newark, New Jersey
December 1, 1956

Present:

Dean C. Willard Heckel, president, presiding; Rabbi Jonathan J. Prinz; Kenneth A. Gibson; Mrs. Cecil Arons; Willie Wright; Timothy Still; Rev. B.F. Johnson; Miss Hilda Hildago; Mrs. Estelle Pierce; Edward A. Kirk; Aldo Giacchino; Fr. Thomas Petrillo; Sidney Reitman, legal counsel

Staff: Donald M. Wendell; James H. Blair; Mrs. Beatrice V. Esley; Norman Steinlauf; Miss Andree V. McKeithan

Guests: Oliver Lofton; Dickinson R. Debevoise; Mrs. Annamay Sheppard; David Shepherd; Dr. Helen Strauss; Walter Dawkins; Gary Skoloff

NEWARK LEGAL
SERVICES PROJECT

Dean Heckel brought to the attention of the Executive Committee an allegation of gross neglect on the part of staff toward the Newark Legal Services Project. At the request of Mr. Debevoise, NLSP President, this item was docketed for discussion today.

Before going into the specifics of the allegation, Mr. Debevoise emphasized that NLSP is completely in support of the entire budgetary program and concept of the UCC. He spoke of the tremendous rapport developed between NLSP and the Area Boards including the free criticism between them and the discussion of any problems which develop. The basic problem, he feels, is with the UCC headquarters structure. He explained that as NLSP envisions it, the UCC staff's function is to serve and assist the Area Boards and the delegate agencies rather than blocking the passage between them and the UCC Board of Trustees.

Mr. Debevoise said that working through the impenetrable mechanics of the UCC has given NLSP concern for such specific problem areas as:

- (1) lack of communication -- including unanswered correspondence and unacknowledged telephone calls;
- (2) failure to notify the NLSP of meetings which directly involve the project;
- (3) unnecessary red tape, i.e., duplicating over 100 copies of the project's proposal, attendance at committee meetings where not enough members are present to act and where NLSP representatives are asked to answer the same questions by two separate committees.

Mr. Debevoise also told the committee that there probably would have been no objection from NLSP or its Board regarding the transferral of \$50,000 of their unexpended funds but to not be informed of this action, particularly in light of the absolute

confusion as to how much money will be left over and to not have a chance to determine what effect this will have on their budget, constituted a threat to the integrity of the whole NLSP project.

Concerning the request for reallocation of funds to carry NLSP from January 1 to May 1, 1967, Mr. Debevoise explained that the initial correspondence dated from July 19, 1966 and that copies of that application had been forwarded to the NLSP representative at Regional OEO. He said that as far as could be ascertained, UCC had taken no action to process that application, but since his meeting with Dean Heckel, he had been informed that the application has been submitted to Regional OEO. On behalf of NLSP, Mr. Debevoise asked:

- (1) that this committee instruct the staff of UCC that if the reallocation request is not in New York that it be handled there tomorrow and that its progress be checked on a daily basis until approval to reallocate those accrued funds is obtained;
- (2) that if approval is not received by December 15, the staff be instructed to supply NLSP with instructions as to how the project will continue;
- (3) that the transferral of \$50,000 of NLSP funds be reviewed to determine what implication this reallocation will have on the project; and
- (4) that there be a review of Task Force procedures.

Dean Heckel informed the NLSP representatives that the corporation had, in the past, authorized reallocation of funds from one agency to another, as can be done under the CAP Guide, without notifying the agency from whose accruals the monies were being taken. He extended an apology on behalf of the corporation for such past actions and stated that when, in the future, funds are to be reallocated from one component to another, we will insure that the agency receives proper notification of such action.

Mr. R. Itman advised that no action could be taken by the Executive Committee in revising action already taken by the Board on the \$50,000 reallocation but that a Board member could request reconsideration of the Board's decision to seek Regional OEO's approval to reallocate.

Rabbi Prinz then suggested that perhaps Mr. Moore and his committee could address themselves to this problem. Although he conceded the lack of adequate communication, he suggested that the shortage of executive staff might possibly explain this problem since most of them are carrying the responsibility of two or three slots instead of one.

Dean Heckel advised the NLSP representatives that at their current rate of expenditure, it is possible for the project to remain operative until June and even beyond. The committee instructed that staff explain the implications of the \$50,000 reallocation in direct correspondence to the project director. In accordance with UCC procedures, the request for reallocation will be docketed on the agenda of the next regular Board meeting.

MOTION

Rabbi Prinz moved that the committee authorize staff to urgently pursue approval of the reallocation of NLSP accrued funds in the

Regional office of OEO on an informal basis subject to the final approval by our Board.
Motion seconded.

Mr. Reitman stated that this motion was unnecessary because staff can be directed to follow through with the Regional office but that the request for reallocation should be submitted to the Board and if Regional OEO approves, the Board's approval can be nunc pro temp.

Mr. Debevoise stressed again the urgency of the UCC staff's pursuit of OEO approval and indicated that this action warranted any harassment, any number of telephone calls, any amount of correspondence, etc., which might be required to reach a successful end. However, Mr. Glechinno suggested that the staff not seek OEO approval until the Board acts because this might be interpreted as a usurping of the functions of the Board. In consequence, the committee agreed that we should press for signing of the approval for a date after December 15 but try to eliminate the encumbrance of all red tape except signature prior to that date.

MOTION AMENDED

It was moved, seconded, and passed that the motion be amended to read that this committee authorize staff to urgently pursue

approval of the reallocation of NLSP accrued funds, other than the actual signing of the official document by the Regional Office of OEO subject to the final approval of our Board at its December 15th meeting.

MOTION

It was moved that the Executive Committee recommend to the Board of Trustees that it recommend to OEO that permission be granted to NLSP to use its own accruals for the extension of its program. Motion seconded and adopted.

Several members of the committee commended the work of the NLSP, its excellent service, and its promotion of the maximum feasible participation concept in its identification with the people in the area board communities.

When the representatives of NLSP were dismissed, Mr. Lofton and Mr. Reitman also departed to continue the discussion on the legality of UCC's obtaining OEO approval prior to transferring 10% of funds.

REPORT OF PRESIDENT

Dean Heckel read from correspondence regarding Area Board representation on the Essex County Welfare Board. He advised

the committee that this item will be docketed on the agenda of the next regular Board meeting as no discussion was necessary.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE

TO PLAN AFFAIR FOR

MR. TYSON

Mr. Gibson reported that because of the time element, the affair for Mr. Tyson had again been postponed. He suggested, however, the possibility of having an anniversary celebration of the first actual funding of the corporation in conjunction with the affair honoring Mr. Tyson.

MOTION

It was moved that Mr. Gibson set in motion the necessary processes for our first annual celebration of our initial funding of this corporation at which we will honor Cyril Tyson, former executive director. Motion seconded and passed.

Mr. Gibson asked that anyone who has suggestions for the celebration or who wishes to serve on his committee please contact him.

**PROGRAMMATIC
RECOMMENDATIONS FOR
AREA BOARDS**

Dean Heckel introduced David Shepherd, consultant to community action on the state level from Scientific Resources, Inc. (SRI). Mr. Shepherd was invited to speak to the committee because he has ideas on devising ways in which area boards might be productive on low cost budgets. Dean Heckel reminded the committee that one of the most important activities of this corporation is to help our Area Boards move forward fruitfully within our guidelines. We will be faced with an even greater challenge in the coming year because of the anticipated cutback in funds so that we must offer even more programmatic assistance to the Area Boards.

Mr. Shepherd indicated that he is interested in developing a program whereby the communities can assess their own resources through surveys and decide what they would like to experience. He feels that over a period of time and through proper management, the people will be able to actually change the statistics of the community, i.e., real estate value, number of children in the schools, etc.

Mr. Shepherd also explained his theories on the interpersonal relations of poverty. He noted that the primary function of the SRI consultant was to raise the level of the trainee to the point where he himself could become the trainer; the consultant then would move out of the community before those trained could become dependent upon him. He was confident that SRI could find or even create the necessary materials to train the people in how to deal with the professional, how to cope with city planners, and in other meaningful training programs.

The committee was again made aware of the existence of consultant funds and instructed Mr. Wright to convene the Area Board presidents in order that they themselves might hear and discuss the recommendations of Mr. Shepherd and Dr. Strauss, his assistant.

BLAZER

Mr. Dawkins, Blazer project director, informed the committee that an impasse had been reached in obtaining the corporation's approval of the Blazer request for refunding. The project had been evaluated and approved by the central staff and the Program Committee but could not be brought before the Board of Trustees because the Employment Task Force had not acted upon it. He explained further that because the proposal had been presented to the Task Force twice without recommendations to move it forward, Blazer was at a loss as to what action should now be taken on their part.

MOTION

It was moved and seconded that the Blazer proposal be docketed for action at the next regular Board meeting. Motion passed.

The committee instructed staff and the Program Committee to insure that their evaluations are forwarded to the Board members prior to that time.

AGENDA OF BOARD
MEETING OF
DECEMBER 15th

The Program Committee was instructed to establish dollar priorities for presentation at the next regular Board meeting.

REPORT OF ACTING
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

Suit Against UCC

Mr. Wendell reported that legal suit had been initiated against the corporation, the PAL, the City of Newark, and the Neighborhood Youth Corps for payment of the insurance premium for the 1955 Summer Block Recreation Program. He reminded the committee that there was initially no provision in the Summer Block project budget for this insurance and that no payment could be made without approval from OEO. No decision as yet has come from the Regional Office.

Insurance Coverage

Mr. Wendell reminded the committee that for some time now we have been trying desperately to get insurance coverage against burglary, etc. He read to the committee correspondence from a broker in which he was advised that insurance could be obtained from Lloyds of London and added that staff would pursue further information regarding rates, etc.

MOTION

It was moved that we recruit people from the Area Boards to patrol UCC central headquarters instead of hiring a guard service and that monies be used from unfilled existing staff lines to pay them. Motion seconded and passed.

It was suggested by counsel that an inquiry be made to determine whether or not a burglar alarm system could be installed in central and to see if the landlord will absorb the costs.

After considerable discussion it was agreed that implementation of this motion be held up until we get more information on the burglar alarm system.

Job Corps

It was moved and seconded that the corporation become involved in the screening of Job Corps candidates. Motion passed.

OEO-CAP Fiscal
Guidelines

This item docketed for the next meeting of this committee.

Respectfully submitted,

Andrew V. McKelthen